

Illinois U Library

SEPTEMBER 23, 1952

733rd BROADCAST

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by 300 Stations of the ABC Radio Network



g. U. S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

Should We Back a Policy of Liberation or Containment?

Moderator, ORVILLE HITCHCOCK

Speakers

CHARLES J. KERSTEN

CLARENCE R. DECKER



THE LISTENER TALKS BACK

on

"Can Hospital Costs Be Lowered?"

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 36, N. Y.

VOLUME 18, NUMBER 19



\$5.00 A YEAR, 15c A COPY



Town Meeting

VOL. 18

No. 19



Should We Back a Policy of Liberation or Containment?

The Broadcast of September 23, 1952, from 9:00 to 9:45 p.m., E.D.T., over the American Broadcasting Company Radio Network, originated from the Congregation Israel Auditorium in Glencoe, Illinois, under the auspices of the North Shore Forum.

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of views presented.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

REP. CHARLES J. KERSTEN—Republican of Wisconsin. Born in Chicago in 1902, Mr. Kersten is a graduate of Marquette University College of Law and has been a practising lawyer in Milwaukee since 1928. He was elected to the 80th Congress in 1946 and to the 82nd Congress in 1950. In his first term he served on the House Committee on Education and Labor, also taking an interest in foreign affairs and in all measures designed to combat communism, nationally and internationally. He actively supported the Economic Cooperation program and helped to eliminate discrimination in the Displaced Persons Act. He urged an export embargo on strategic materials to the USSR and its satellites and introduced a resolution pledging American help to free governments resisting aggression. In the 82nd Congress, Mr. Kersten called for the withdrawal of diplomatic relations with the USSR and its satellites, and sponsored an amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1951, providing for a program whereby escapees from behind the Iron Curtain could be utilized as elements of the North Atlantic Army.

DR. CLARENCE R. DECKER—President of the University of Kansas City; former Assistant Director for Far East for the Mutual Security Administration. Dr. Decker was born in Sioux City, Iowa, in 1904, received his A. B. from Carleton College in 1925 and his Ph. D. from the University of Chicago in 1928. He has taught at North Dakota, DePaul and Northwestern Universities. From 1929 to 1931 he was Professor of English at Wesleyan University. Dr. Decker traveled extensively in Europe from 1931 to 1933 and studied at the University of Berlin. Returning to this country, he became Chairman of the English Department at University of Kansas City and has been President there since 1938. Dr. Decker is a Special Representative of the American Association for the United Nations in which capacity he traveled through Europe and Asia as a member of "Town Meeting's" World Tour. His post with the Mutual Security Administration, for which he obtained a leave of absence a year ago, terminated this month.

Moderator: ORVILLE HITCHCOCK—Professor of Speech, State University of Iowa.

Town Meeting is published weekly at 32 S. Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio, by The Town Hall, Inc., New York 36, New York. **Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, New York 36, N.Y.**

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, (Canada, \$6.00); six months, \$3.00, (Canada, \$3.50); eight weeks, \$1.00, (Canada, \$1.20); 15c a single copy. Entered as second-class matter May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Copyright, 1952, BY THE TOWN HALL, INC.

Should We Back a Policy of Liberation or Containment?

Announcer: Welcome, friends, to another Town Meeting. Tonight for the third successive year, Town Meeting is originating at the North Shore Forum of Congregation Israel in Glencoe, Illinois, a beautiful suburban community just 22 miles north of Chicago. We're proud to be here again as their guests. The North Shore Forum is sponsored by the Temple Men's Club and Sisterhood, each of whom conducts many other worth-while projects. The Men's club is affiliated with the National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods whose Jewish Chautauqua Society has as its main purpose the teaching of brotherhood in camps and universities.

The Sisterhood, hostess for most Temple functions, sponsors the Temple Youth Group and constantly seeks to be a force for unity within the Temple and in the community at large. Town Hall salutes the North Shore Forum and wishes it a most successful season. And now to preside as moderator for tonight's discussion, here is Doctor Orville Hitchcock, Professor of Speech at the State University of Iowa.

Dr. Hitchcock: Good evening, friends. Tonight, America's Town Meeting originates in the beautiful auditorium of Congregation Israel at Glencoe, Illinois, where we are the guests of the North Shore Forum, one of the fine adult education programs in the Mid-West. Since World War II, the policy of the United States with regard to Russia and the world-wide menace of communism has come to be known as a policy of containment. Briefly, this means that we have undertaken to resist any attempt on the part of Russia to

gain control over additional countries. In recent months the policy of containment has been often questioned.

In the spring of this year, John Foster Dulles called this approach a serious mistake. He said freedom on the defense is not defensible. In August, General Eisenhower urged the United States to include as one of its peaceful aims the restoration to the captive nations of Europe the right to determine their own fate. Later in August, Major General William Donovan declared that the policy of containment is a futile strategy.

To these arguments Secretary Acheson has answered that any attempt to liberate Soviet dominated countries by force would lead to disaster. President Truman and Governor Stevenson have made similar statements. Thus the issue is joined.

You and I have many opinions, many doubts, many questions on this vital matter. We look forward with anticipation, therefore, to tonight's discussion. Our speakers, exceptionally well qualified on the subject, are Representative Charles J. Kersten, Republican of Wisconsin, author of the Kersten amendment to the Mutual Security Law of 1951 that provides for aid to liberation movements and Dr. Clarence Decker, President of the University of Kansas City and former Assistant Director of the Mutual Security Agency for the Far East.

Suppose we turn first to Congressman Kersten. Mr. Kersten, I understand that Mr. Eisenhower made the statement to which I referred earlier following a conference with you in August. I wonder if you'd start off our dis-

cussion by telling us briefly your main reasons for believing that we should move from a policy of containment to one of liberation.

Representative Kersten: Mr. Chairman, it is indeed a great privilege to speak in this beautiful hall of the Temple Congregation Israel. A phrase that I like to use is a phrase that denotes the basis of our civilization that we are defending these days. It is the phrase Judeo-Christian. A few weeks ago Adlai Stevenson said "The United States must be prepared to negotiate and initiate negotiations with the Soviets by give and take."

Now it is well for the American people to ponder the shocking implications of these words. For the masters of the Kremlin are criminals of long standing who have spent their lives, their lifetimes, in breaking and smashing every one of the ten precepts of the Mosaic Law—from the elimination of God from the hearts of the young to the shattering of all human rights and the rights of all minorities—wherever they take over and in the cold blooded murder of over 40 millions of its own defenseless citizens.

Mr. Stevenson says we must negotiate, we must give and take, with these gangster rulers. What must we give? What will they permit us to take? Fifteen months of walking in and out of the tents of Panmunjom should give us somewhat of an answer. What would you say about the mayor of a city who was willing to negotiate, to give and take, with the gangsters who have succeeded in establishing a rule of terror in most of the suburbs of the city.

Mr. Stevenson had his training and Mr. Acheson's State Department which formulated its foreign policy, and George Cannon's fa-

mous Mr. X article in the July, 1947, issue of *Foreign Affairs*—the so-called policy of containment. I'll quote one brief sentence from that which more or less summarizes the basic theory of this policy. Says Mr. Cannon: "It will be clearly seen that the Soviet pressure against the Western world is something that can be contained by the application of counter force at a series of constantly shifting geographical points corresponding to the shifts and maneuvers of Soviet policy." I repeat "corresponding to the shifts and maneuvers of Soviet policy." In other words, we are to engage in a series of Koreas for the next 20 or 30 years bleeding America white and leaving the initiative to the Soviets.

I say there is another policy we can follow that is based on American tradition, which recognizes as still valid that precept set forth in our own Declaration of Independence which recognizes the rights and the duty of an enslaved people to throw off tyranny. We should adopt a policy that does not acquiesce in Stalin's criminal conquests where it is practical to do so. We should render assistance to the enslaved peoples ultimately to attain their liberation.

General Eisenhower's ringing words in his American Legion speech a few weeks ago states, "The American conscience can never know peace until these people, meaning the captive nations, are restored again to being masters of their own fate." These words and such a policy are the only true American policy on this issue. As long as Stalin holds the captive nations and with a free hand is permitted to mold them and their peoples into cogs of his war machine there will be increasing

danger of all-out World War III that everyone wants to avoid. A policy of liberation is the only true policy of peace.

Dr. Hitchcock: Thank you, Mr. Kersten. Now let's hear the views of Dr. Clarence Decker. Dr. Decker has frequently served as moderator of America's Town Meeting, has appeared as a speaker on the program on at least three occasions, in 1949 was a member of the World Town Hall Seminar and has just returned from a three months' inspection tour for the Mutual Security Agency of Point Four projects in the Far East. Dr. Decker, why do you oppose liberation and support our present foreign policy?

Dr. Decker: Mr. Hitchcock, I support our present foreign policy and I do not defend containment. Containment has nothing to do with our present foreign policy. The President of the United States has never used the word in a public address and Secretary of State Acheson has used it only once and then to attack it. It was used by George B. Cannon in a book which was written as a private citizen. I happen to have a very high regard for that book, but I differ from it in a great many regards.

Now all Americans look to the day when every country held captive by Soviet imperialism will once again be independent. Liberation is what we all want. So there's nothing new about the goal of Mr. Dulles' and Mr. Kersten's so-called crusade. Liberation is, in fact, a proclaimed major objective of our present foreign policy. If there's any quarrel between us it is a quarrel about means and not about ends. I think we ought to get that clear right at the beginning.

The trouble with Mr. Kersten's proposals is, in the first place, that they can't be carried out. In the second place if they could be carried out they would certainly involve the United States in war today. And the trouble with Mr. Dulles' proposals is that no one, including Mr. Dulles, knows quite what they're all about. It is clear, however, in what direction they tend. They tend to encourage the people behind the Iron Curtain to start revolts, revolts which would be ruthlessly suppressed by the Soviet authorities unless we sent our armed forces to their support.

Do we want another Lidice and another Warsaw? This course would mean either failure or war. It would be moral cowardice for the United States to encourage revolts which it was unwilling to back up with its own armed forces. What baffles me about these suggestions is that they come from the same men who favor reducing military and economic assistance to our allies.

These drastic cuts I need hardly add can come only from our defense budget. Thus we are asked to pursue a course which greatly increases the risk of war for us and for the entire world and at the same time we are asked to reduce our preparedness program. I don't understand that kind of program, I don't understand that kind of logic, but there is an alternative program which in my judgment is consistent both with our desire to build a just and durable peace and with our recognition that such a peace cannot be based on the continued enslavement of the satellite countries.

The Soviet Union solemnly pledged itself to assure the independence of the countries of eastern Europe. By signing the charter of the United Nations the

Soviet Union agreed to abide by certain rules of international conduct. Now it is our purpose to hold the Soviet Union to these pledges. As the free world grows in strength, our steady and patient pressure on the Soviet Union to respect these pledges will grow in effectiveness.

It is the Soviet rulers who are afraid of our strength and our peaceful purpose. That is why they build iron curtains and bamboo curtains. They know that tyranny cannot long endure side by side with freedom. They can win only by force and if we are so strong that they dare not use force then we can be sure that liberation will eventually come. Our first job, therefore, is to build a strong America and a strong free world, and from that position of military, economic and moral strength to drive fanaticism, imperialism, and dictatorship from the face of the globe. (*Applause*)

Dr. Hitchcock: Thank you, Dr. Decker. Now I wonder if you gentlemen would join me around the microphone so that we can discuss this question among ourselves a bit before we take questions from the audience here at Congregation Israel. Dr. Decker, I guess maybe one of the first questions we should ask, and maybe you've already answered it in part, is this: Is our present foreign policy only or primarily one of containment?

Dr. Decker: That is, does the term containment correctly describe our present foreign policy? Mr. Hitchcock, our government is forging a strong foreign policy not of containment but of attainment. That policy is embodied in the positive Marshall Plan, the dynamic ECA and MSA programs, the bold new Point Four program, the Atlantic and Pacific pacts, NATO, the

Japanese Peace Treaty, European Federation, support of the United Nations and in other affirmative ways. That policy has stopped Russian expansion in Asia, the Mediterranean, and Western Europe. It has kept Japan on our side; it has promoted the defection of Tito. This policy is by no means perfect. I have criticized it myself, but it is growing stronger, and more rapidly than many of us think, and it should be continued by whoever is elected the next president. Almost all of these major accomplishments I have listed have been accomplished within the past five years.

Now we're stepping up our counter offensive, a counter offensive that seeks success not in war of Mr. Dulles or Mr. Kersten with modifications, except as a last resort, but in pressure from an assured position of military, economic, and moral strength. But at this critical moment, especially in an election year, I beg of all of us let us keep our powder dry, our heads clear and our policy firm, sober, and above all responsible.

Dr. Hitchcock: Mr. Kersten, I gather you don't quite agree with that.

Representative Kersten: I want to congratulate Dr. Decker for moving over from the position of defending a policy of containment and agreeing that we should have a policy that looks toward liberation. I think he deserves congratulations on that and I wish he had more influence in our Department of State. I would like to quote from an April, 1952, speech of Mr. Acheson in which he states in part, "We have always negotiated, we have been negotiating for years with the Soviet Union. We have never stopped negotiating. The question is not whether

you are willing to negotiate but what can you negotiate about and whether there is any real desire to negotiate. In other words what the leaders of the present administration are attempting to do and what I quoted Mr. Stevenson concerning also was the proposition of a desire on the part of our government of the present administration to negotiate with the enslavers of 800,000,000 people and to forget about those people.

Now there's one thing I want to make a distinction concerning, right at this point, and I don't wish to have words put into my mouth as to what I am advocating. I am not, neither has Mr. Dulles, and neither has General Eisenhower advocated a war or wars of liberation. We have advocated a policy that looks toward the liberation of these people as against their enslavers. And the administration is seeking, is constantly seeking, to negotiate with these tyrants that enslave these people. I think as this discussion follows I will be able to show and demonstrate that this policy of liberation is the only true policy of peace and that the policy pursued by the administration, a policy of containment, will lead to direct all-out World War III in the not-distant future.

Dr. Hitchcock: Mr. Kersten, that has brought back Dr. Decker who has something more to say.

Dr. Decker: I wish to quote from Senator Wiley, Republican of the great state of Wisconsin, September 10 in the *New York Herald Tribune*, "We have taken the offensive and started building up strength not only for ourselves but our allies," he told reporters as he came back from Europe. We have sought to reach the people behind the Iron Curtain through

the Voice of America and a lot of things that can't even be told about and I can't talk about those things but Mr. Kersten knows some of those things as a member of our Congress and he must know that we are building strength.

Do we have a positive program? This is Senator Dulles before he started electioneering when he was still in the State Department. He said that there was an apparent slackening of cold war pressure "because the Soviet communist tactics cannot prevail against such curative and creative programs as we have been evolving over the past two years." Where is containment in either one of those statements? (*Applause*)

Dr. Hitchcock: Mr. Kersten, do you want to tell us where containment is in those two statements?

Representative Kersten: I would say that beyond certain propaganda broadcasts, the Voice of America, and other similar efforts the administration has not moved affirmatively so far as these people are concerned—that is, the people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. And I think I might point out to Dr. Decker one very important omission in this regard. Congress in 1951 passed a law allocating 100 million dollars to be used in behalf of selected persons who had escaped from or who are residing in the communist dominated countries. Now that portion of the law has not been in any sense implemented, and the reason as I was advised by members of the State Department is that the implementation of that law pointed too much toward liberation.

Can't you see the implication of that law, or that portion of the law? In other words, if these escapees who escaped from the iron curtain countries were formed into

military units to be attached to the European defense army to help build up this strength that we all want to build up with the uniforms of their countries on, like Poland and Czechoslovakia, Hungary and these other countries and with the flags of those countries that would imply the eventual liberation of those countries.

It would have a great deterrent effect upon Stalin; it would have very much the effect of defection from the satellite armies just as if—God forbid—this country were ever taken over by the Reds and dominated by a Soviet Marshal and the American armed forces were dominated by the communists, as it is in these countries.

And if at the same time there were free American units of American boys with American uniforms and American flags in Mexico or Canada, do you think that the American boys under the direction of the Soviets would ever want to fight those units? Of course they would not. It would be a great deterrent to the Soviets. And most of them would want to escape through to them, and Mr. Acheson and the State Department have not put this provision in the law into action because it points too much toward liberation. (*Applause*)

Dr. Hitchcock: Thank you, Mr. Kersten. Mr. Decker, do you have a comment you want to make on that about this fund for liberation?

Dr. Decker: They haven't put it into effect as yet because it won't work and it can't work and it won't do the things that Mr. Kersten thinks that it will do. The Pentagon has under study the plan for a Foreign Legion. No one is opposed to that, *per se*. But it should be remembered that there are today only some 18,000 escapees eligible for service in the

units envisaged by Mr. Kersten—hardly enough for one infantry division—and it's doubtful that more than 2,000 are actually qualified for combat service.

Yet our military problem is to build sufficient strength to face 175 Russian divisions—they're only half as large as ours—175 Russian divisions and perhaps as many as 50 or 75 satellite country divisions. Now there are many other reasons why we can't, why we're not doing it, but this is the most telling one.

The Kersten Amendment makes available 100 million dollars to help in the resettlement of escapees but that money is taken out of the money that is also allocated for our allies. That means if we chase this will-o'-the-wisp that Mr. Kersten and Mr. Dulles and others are talking about, that means fewer tanks and guns and less equipment for our allies in Europe. Under present conditions this seems to me a penny-wise, pound-foolish transfer of funds. (*Applause*)

Dr. Hitchcock: Mr. Kersten will now speak on the Kersten Amendment.

Representative Kersten: I'd like to comment on that because I've been doing a fair amount of study and work in connection with that amendment and I do know that the Department of Defense favors the implementation of this amendment. They feel that it has great psychological possibilities.

As a matter of fact, one official in the Pentagon remarked to me that one such battalion of escapees from Hungary or Rumania or Poland in the uniforms of their own countries, one such battalion would be worth a division of American, French or British troops, because of its psychological effect. In other words, it would

be greatly stepping up the defense of Europe, and furthermore it would have a great effect upon the ability of Stalin to control the satellite armies. In other words this would be a great strengthening of the Western defenses and a great deterrent to Stalin in starting war in Europe.

Dr. Decker: Mr. Kersten, may I ask a question? Does this mean that you're in favor of using force to liberate Soviet dominated countries?

Representative Kersten: No, it does not mean that. It means that we should set the stage that looks toward the eventual liberation of these peoples. I believe that the force that will result in the present negative bankrupt policy of containment will far overshadow anything that the world has ever seen. I believe that if we can join hands with the people behind the iron curtain at opportune times that together these 800 million people and the rest of the free world can rid the world of that which is troubling us all now—these very few communist tyrants.

Dr. Hitchcock: Thank you. Dr. Decker, do you have a question you'd like to ask Mr. Kersten?

Dr. Decker: Well, I wanted to make a comment on his last observation. There is no responsible statesman I know who believes for a moment that we can today disintegrate the Soviet empire from within solely by propaganda, useful as it is, and the ones who want to step this up are the ones who cut the appropriation for Voice of America last year. Let's not forget it, or the promotion of premature rebellions which could provoke only bloody retaliation, or the formation of refugee for-

eign legions, which isn't feasible at the present time.

Rebel leadership behind the iron curtain has been either liquidated or immobilized by the secret police. And we must remember that you can't have a pitchfork rebellion in these days of highly industrialized warfare. The armaments that are necessary to modern war—great tanks and guided missiles—are firmly controlled by the state. Defection at the top by men who control the army is always possible, but even a coup at this level unless supported militarily by us would simply repeat the slaughter of Warsaw. So I don't think in the proposal that we have here tonight that we even have a calculated risk; I think we have a risky calculation. (*Applause*)

Dr. Hitchcock: Thank you. Mr. Kersten says he wants to comment on that.

Representative Kersten: I think it's very important, folks, to make a distinction (the doctor insists on putting words into my mouth) in wars of liberation and encouraging revolts behind the iron curtain. Now a policy that looked toward the liberation of these peoples enslaved behind the iron curtain would prevent abortive uprisings. There have been many abortive uprisings since the communists took over. There have been millions of people liquidated.

If we adopted an intelligent, resourceful policy all of the potential resistance could be organized and held until the proper time, and abortive uprisings could be prevented and as a matter of fact the Department of Defense has already set up plans for the implementation of 35,000 of these escapees, each in their various battalions realizing their psychological potentials.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Dr. Hitchcock: Thank you. Now we're ready to take questions from our large and enthusiastic audience here in Glencoe and we'll start with a question from the lady.

Lady: Mr. Kersten, would you call Korea liberation or containment?

Dr. Hitchcock: Mr. Kersten, what about Korea? How do you label that?

Mr. Kersten: I would call Korea containment, and I think that's a very marvelous example of the ineffectiveness of such a policy. In other words, we have merely tried to contain the red forces in Korea and we stopped effective fighting even defensively when Mr. Malik, the Soviet master, requested that we talk, have truce talks, and for 15 months we've been having those talks in the tents of Panmunjom and I think they have been very ineffective.

Man: I want to ask Congressman Kersten if he would bomb Manchuria and carry the warfare in a real program of liberation upon the mainland of China.

Representative Kersten: I am not a military man. I don't know whether it's the proper thing, militarily, to bomb the bases of Manchuria. I suspect it was; in fact I'm quite sure it was at a prior time. There's one thing I do feel very strongly about, however. We should implement every force in the East to fight the Red Chinese. They are throwing everything at us and there are many things which could be used against them, notably the Chinese Nationalists.

Dr. Hitchcock: Thank you. We wish to thank the hundreds of

listeners who sent us questions for tonight's Town Meeting. Every week we send a complete 20 volume set of the American People's Encyclopedia to the listener who submits the most appropriate question. Our program staff has decided that this week's encyclopedia goes to Mrs. P. Parazaider of Downer's Grove, Illinois, who submitted the following question for our two speakers: "Among sovereign states without an internationally recognized authority with supra-national jurisdiction what gives any country the right to liberate citizens of another nation?" Congressman Kersten, would you like to grapple with that question first?

Representative Kersten: I don't think any country has the right to go in, and on its own initiative and against the will of another people to in any way interfere in their internal affairs. But I do think any country has a right to give assistance to an enslaved people who are begging for some help if that help can be given, and one instance I'd like to remind Americans about in that regard is the instance in which the French helped the American colonies in the Revolutionary War to gain their independence and I think that helped a great deal. I think they had a right to do that and we were very glad to get it.

Dr. Hitchcock: Thank you, Mr. Kersten. Dr. Decker, do you have any comment on that question?

Dr. Decker: Well, I would agree entirely, and Mr. Kersten and I are in agreement about a great many things that ought to be done, though this discussion

this evening may not sound as if that were so. On the other hand, the very important point is that if we have the right to go into Poland or Latvia or any of those other countries the commies have the right to come here. Mr. Kersten has been leading a crusade against the communists in this country and I'm with him on that score, but if we had such a fifth column in this country we would naturally put them up against a firing wall and that's exactly what the commies are going to do in Poland and in Lithuania and the rest of them. They've got a secret police even more powerful than our own.

Dr. Hitchcock: Mr. Kersten, for a brief comment.

Representative Kersten: Of course Dr. Decker is constantly reiterating that which I have not said that we should go into these countries and ourselves with our own armies liberate them. We should give them practical aid to help them liberate themselves and that's the point. (*Applause*)

Dr. Decker Mr. Kersten, you're going to bribe them with 100 million dollars. His bill says to any selected persons who are *residing in*. If the commies appropriated 100 million dollars to form a fifth column in this country I wonder what the Americans would do.

Representative Kersten: Well, I wonder if Dr. Decker can decide for himself as to whether we are right or wrong in this struggle with the world or whether the communists are right or wrong. We think we are.

Dr. Decker: I could decide very easily. I think we're right but I don't want to be foolish in winning our cause. I think I love our country with the same loyalty and

patriotism and enthusiasm of Mr. Kersten. I love it so much I don't want to be foolish about it. (*Applause*)

Dr. Hitchcock: Ladies and gentlemen, I'm still here. I've been fighting to get at some questions from our audience. I wonder if we could take a question from the gentleman on the left.

Man: Dr. Decker, would not this Dulles so-called policy of liberation cause us to lose the support of the free countries of Europe which we now have?

Dr. Decker: Not only of free Europe but of free Asia. I've just come back from a three months' tour of Asia and I can assure all of you in this room that our friends shudder at Mr. Kersten's proposal. At the very moment when we need to win friends and influence people around the world our crusading liberationists frighten them into a neutralism more determined than ever before. Perhaps they are unjustified in their almost pathological fear that a rich, powerful and impulsive America may plunge them into a global war which they abhor and for which they are ill prepared, but the grim fact remains that Mr. Dulles' words are fomenting just such fear in India, in Burma and in Indonesia today.

Dr. Hitchcock: Thank you. Another question for Mr. Kersten.

Man: Representative Kersten, now that Russia has the atomic bomb and we no longer hold the balance of military power, how can we hope for anything better than a negotiated peace?

Representative Kersten: If we cannot hope for anything better than a negotiated peace with the present tyrants of Soviet Russia, I say God help America and God

help the whole world; because the way events have gone in the last five years we're going straight down the path of all-out World War III, of an armaments race. We are building the greatest, the finest weapons we can build and Russia is doing the same thing. We are giving Stalin a free hand to mold the opinions of his own people, to mold them into satellite armies. We have abandoned those peoples and what I am advocating is that we join hands with those peoples to help the world get rid of these communist tyrants that are bringing us down the path to World War III.

Dr. Hitchcock: Thank you, Mr. Kersten. Now I see another gentleman with a question.

Man: Dr. Decker, don't you think a much expanded Point Four program will assist both containment and liberation without the danger of war?

Dr. Decker I certainly do, and I want to repeat a very trite phrase—that while bullets are apparently important where there is a threat of war, I think bread is far more important. The great struggle today is the struggle of underdeveloped countries. I have seen things in Asia and in Southeast Asia which are simply unbelievable. Until we bring those potentially rich countries—rich in natural resources, rich in brain power, in man power and in culture—until they have a chance to get on their feet, we are going to be fighting wars all over the world. But what I want to do is *not* to cut the appropriation of Point Four 60 per cent, as was done last spring by Mr. Kersten's colleagues—60 per cent—when we're trying to keep people who are already our allies on our side. If that goes on we'll be having to build for-

eign legions from refugees inside Burma, Thailand and all over the world.

It seems to me it's the most foolish kind of approach to this problem. We've got a chance now and we are moving ahead. India's moved greatly over on our side, even though she is still, at least publicly, pursuing a policy of neutralism. Burma has made tremendous strides. I wish I could tell you some of the stories this evening. She still takes officially the neutral policy but she is now on our side. Let us strengthen the friends we have, then we will win this battle against the communists. (*Applause*)

Dr. Hitchcock: Thank you. Mr. Kersten has a comment.

Representative Kersten: Well, certainly as a long-range policy we should do all we can within our own means to assist the peoples that need to be strengthened, but we must keep in mind that the short-range problem is one of opposing Russian aggression. Now the problem of Russian aggression, particularly in the areas where they have taken over, is not primarily our battle. It is primarily the battle of people of Poland, of Hungary, Czechoslovakia and of China, and if we do not want to enlist those people as a foreign legion, *not as a foreign legion* I repeat, to an American army, but as the nucleus of peoples who will eventually attain their own freedom; if we want to do all the fighting, if we want to send our boys all over the world to do the fighting for Poland and Czechoslovakia and China that's all right for Mr. Decker's policy, but I don't advocate that. It's primarily their battle and we should assist *them* in their battle.

Dr. Decker: I'm having some

words put in my mouth now for a change. In order to keep our boys from having to fight in the Far East where there is a hot war going on in Indo China, the last Congress cut the amount for economic support and military support over 13 per cent. They are also great supporters of Chiang Kai-shek, as you know, and so am I under the present circumstances. They also cut his support 13 per cent. Still we'll spend some money here to dangle before Mao Tse-tung in the hope that some people behind that curtain will escape through Hong Kong and form a foreign legion, when we've already got the legion in operation on Formosa. Well, Congress incidentally did appropriate about seven billion dollars just a few months ago for this purpose.

Dr. Hitchcock: Thank you. We have a question from a gentleman.

Man: I have a question for Representative Kersten. Since Governor Stevenson said, substantially, peace is the ultimate objective of all diplomacy, negotiation its essence, would you rule out negotiation and leave war the inevitable ultimate?

Representative Kersten: No, I certainly would not. I would negotiate with the true representatives of these peoples, but I'll ask you do you think that the communists are the true representatives of these peoples?

Man: You're asking me if the communists are? I'll be very happy to answer it if you'll give me the opportunity.

Representative Kersten: The question is a rhetorical one. I don't think they are.

Dr. Hitchcock: Well, this is America's Town Meeting and we say that the people in the audience are supposed to answer. Thank

you very much. Now could we have a question from the gentleman on the left?

Man: Dr. Decker, you just touched on part of this question but I'd like to have your comments on what positive results our program is showing in Asia as per your recent visit there?

Dr. Decker: I was in the Far East in 1949 as a private citizen with Town Hall of the Air. We were putting on broadcasts. I think most of us came home and made fairly glum reports of what we saw there. What has happened in the last three years is nothing short of a miracle, and I wish we had a separate program so that I could tell you some of the things I've seen—the new spirit and the new life that is coming into that area. I can't go into all of the details but I can say in general that the economies are much stronger, that we are on the move, and that I think that barring an actual outbreak of war or the fomentation of a war for which we are unprepared, that the next five or six years are going to see a remarkable change in the entire world situation regardless of who wins the election.

Dr. Hitchcock: Mr. Kersten, do you have a comment for about ten seconds?

Representative Kersten: Yes, finally I'd just like to say this one thing; in order for Stalin to carry on aggressive war he must have the will of the people behind the iron curtain on his side. We should do what we can to get that will on our side. The present policy of dividing the world up between half slave and half free, arming both sides, is leading us right down the road to all-out World War III.

Dr. Hitchcock: Mr. Kersten,

I'm sorry to interrupt. Thank you, gentlemen, for this very informative discussion of a highly complex problem. On behalf of Town Hall we wish to express our appreciation to the North Shore Forum of Congregation Israel here

in Glencoe, and particularly to the Forum's general chairman, Mr. Gilmore Kahnweiler, and its business manager, Melvin Todes. So plan to be with us next week and every week at the sound of the Crier's Bell.



FOR FURTHER STUDY OF THIS WEEK'S TOPIC

Background Questions

1. Does the liberation versus containment issue clearly indicate the alternatives in foreign policy confronting the American people? Or, is it an oversimplification designed to win the votes of national minorities?
2. Is our present foreign policy correctly described as a policy of containment? Are the Truman Doctrine, NATO, the Japanese Peace Treaty and ANZUS, all part of a policy of containment?
3. Both the Democratic and Republican presidential candidates have stated that we must patiently reconcile ourselves to long term East-West tension. Has this been sufficiently explained to the American people?
4. Both presidential candidates have stated that they look forward to the ultimate freeing of satellite nations from Russian domination. Has this been implicit in our foreign policy to date?
5. Is the idea of containment the cornerstone of our present policy? Or, is it regarded as a necessary facet of our policy, a stop-gap phase of our policy during which we can build our power?
6. Is the containment idea an example of "barrier thinking" or does it constitute a new, creative appraisal of our world position and responsibilities?
7. Was the containment idea developed with any particular area of the world in mind? Is it geared more toward Europe's problems than toward Asia's?
8. Has containment served its immediate purpose of building our own strength and stopping further Russian expansion?
9. Does containment offer our opponents an inducement to come to terms? Or, does it deny us the means of exercising pressures on the enemy?
10. Is there validity in the theory that our policy will inevitably be determined by Russian actions?
11. What is the reasoning behind the recent criticism of "mere containment"? Do the critics of containment mean that we should actively seek by limited means to liberate the Iron Curtain countries?
12. Can the United States help to free Communist-controlled nations without the use or the readiness to use major force? If so, how?
13. Could propaganda and information do the job? Could they stir up enough resistance behind the Iron Curtain to insure liberation?
 - a. Has the Voice of America been operating effectively? If not, what can be done to improve its effectiveness?
 - b. Who is responsible for the recent cut in appropriations for our Information Services?

14. Should we engage in limited trade and diplomatic relations with satellite nations in an effort to wean them away from Soviet domination? Or, would the Soviet Union exploit these relations for its own advantage?
 15. Could we foster successful revolutions by encouraging passive resistance, industrial sabotage, sowing discontent and supplying resistance movements by air drops? Or, would we be encouraging people to risk their lives needlessly in fruitless efforts?
 16. Should a liberation policy aim to influence masses of people in the satellite nations? Or, should it seek to encourage defection (Titoism) of the men at or near the top who control the police and armies?
 17. Must the United States be prepared for war if it pursues any offensive policy beyond propaganda?
 - a. If so, isn't building up our strength a necessary prerequisite?
 - b. Or, do we know enough about Russia's policies to be able to safely predict that she will not call our bluff?
 18. Will Russia let her satellites go without a fight? Is the fear that she won't, the reason for the disturbed reaction of our European allies to General Eisenhower's American Legion speech?
 19. Will our allies willingly support us in any policy that goes beyond the goal of containing Soviet power? Can we afford to replace a system of collective security with unilateral military strategy?
 20. Is a foreign policy designed to bring about a showdown with Russia consistent with proposed reductions in our defense budget?
 21. Are we giving the impression that we are arming to wage aggressive war?
 22. Can we afford to close the door on negotiation and ignore the possibility, however slight, of peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union?
 23. Is there validity in George Kennan's contention that the United States has too often erred in allowing a missionary attitude to dominate our foreign policy?
-

THE LISTENER TALKS BACK

"CAN HOSPITAL COSTS BE LOWERED?"

Program of September 16, 1952

Dr. Eli Ginsburg

Dr. Anthony J. J. Rourke

VOID OF COMPETITION

I do not see how they (hospital costs) can be reduced under our present regime. The medical profession evidently establishes the standards of qualifications of its doctors and nurses, and these standards are evidently approved by our government. Consequently, they are apparently placed high

enough to limit the number of doctors and nurses and hospitals to the requirements of the rich or well-to-do and to those who would have their loved ones spend their last dollar to save them. Under these conditions neither government nor private capital is going to invest in additional hospitals. It is probably the only

section of our national economy that is void of competition and independent of our free-enterprise system of government, except when threatened with socialization.—
E. F. REED, Del Paso Heights, California.

NOTORIOUS LAXITY

It is generally agreed around here that it is wise to take full advantage of the visiting hours to visit your relatives when in a hospital, in order to insure that the doctors and nurses tend to business. They are notoriously lax. Nurses who work in the hospitals agree also, and advise this supervision.—M. H. JOHNSON, Fountain City, Wisconsin.

INADEQUATE INSURANCE

There is no doubt that the Blue Cross and similar prepayment plans of hospital and medical care certainly do meet the need when and if the emergency should arise. But there is one point that I believe deserves attention and possible correction of the cost to the patient. Under the prepayment plans, the patient is covered only by all services rendered by the hospital employees. Since anesthesia has become a definite and specialized science, as well as an absolute necessity in the performance of operations, I have wondered why the hospitals do not employ sufficient anesthetists on their regular staff. If this were done, that work immediately comes under the coverage of the prepayment plan,

whereas now, each operating physician employs his own anesthetist with an additional cost to the patient. . . . —MICHAEL WALPIN, Bronx, New York.

NICE PROFIT MARGIN

Nursing services, blood donations, drugs, buildings, furnishing, etc., are not free. Charges are exorbitant. Greed becomes thievery. Greatly reduced charges would still maintain a nice profit margin.—MRS. J. DENTON, Oakland, California.

A FREE WORKSHOP

There is one question that millions of people would like to hear answered. . . . Why shouldn't doctors, and particularly surgeons, be required to pay for their use of hospital operating rooms, equipment and assistants' time? . . . I ask you, what other businessman in America is given a workshop, fully equipped, with helpers, experts and everything thrown in—all for nothing!—MRS. MARY WILLIAMS, Cuba, New York.

REVEALING PERFORMANCE

The Doctors and Hospitalers are getting the manners and mentalities of Palm Beach promoters and the American people are going to have to go out into the woods to die. It was a revealing performance. If that represents Americanism, it is not longer anything to fight for.—THOMAS H. DICKENSON, Charlottesville, Virginia.